ORIGINAL



BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION RECEIVED

Chairman Chairman	2009 NOV 23 P 1: 12
GARY PIERCE Commissioner	AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCKET CONTROL
PAUL NEWMAN Commissioner	
SANDRA D. KENNEDY Commissioner	Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED
BOB STUMP Commissioner	NOV 2 8 2009
IN THE MATTER OF THE REVIEW AND POSSIBLE REVISION OF ARIZONA UNIVERSAL SERVICE FUND RULES, ARTICLE 12 OF THE ARIZONA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE))) Docket No. RT-00000H-97-0137)
IN THE MATTER OF THE INVESTIGATION OF THE COST OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCESS)) Docket No. T-00000D-00-0672

RESPONSE OF QWEST CORPORATION AND QWEST COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, LLC TO MOTION FOR AUTHORIZATION TO REDACT CONTRACT BY TW TELECOM OF ARIZONA LLC

Qwest Corporation and Qwest Communications Company, LLC (collectively, "Qwest") hereby respond to the Motion for Authorization to Redact Contract by two telecom of Arizona llc ("TWT"). TWT has not shown sufficient reason why contracts that are responsive to Qwest's subpoena should be redacted. The Motion should be denied.

TWT admits that it may claim protection for the information that it seeks to redact under the Protective Order that is in effect in these consolidated dockets. (See, Procedural Order and Protective Order, February 3, 2009). The Protective Order provides for the secure handling, limited access, and restricted uses that are permitted for Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information. Yet TWT does not make any claim or argument that the Protective Order is inadequate to protect its information. Nor does TWT make any claim or argument that Qwest or any other entity participating in these dockets has abused, or is likely to abuse or violate the terms of the Protective Order. TWT has not provided persuasive reasons to support its Motion.

As TWT is well aware, protective orders are often used in regulatory proceedings before the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") and other agencies, and such orders are critical to the agencies being able to fulfill their role in regulating in the public interest. TWT's request that the Commission exempt some data as too sensitive to be divulged, even subject to the Protective Order, is not only unsubstantiated, it also strikes at the core concept of protective orders. TWT is asking the Commission to venture onto a slippery slope, in which every responsive, relevant document must be subjected to a second level of analysis, to determine whether some parts or subparts embedded therein may be redacted because of claimed irrelevancy. Such exercises will slow the pace of litigation, and necessarily lead to more disputes such as this. The Protective Order is adequate for the purposes, and redaction is neither necessary nor appropriate.

When TWT asks that it be allowed to redact content that it considers to be proprietary information unrelated to intrastate switched access, TWT is asking that everyone simply accept TWT's judgment in that regard. Qwest believes that it should be afforded the opportunity to reach its own conclusions and to bring its advocacy in that regard before the Commission. From

discovery previously conducted and from contracts that are publicly available, Qwest knows that in some instances CLECs have entered into contracts with an IXC in which the nominal contract rate for intrastate switched access is effectively discounted by other contract sections, as a result of the purchase of unrelated services by the IXC. In those instances, the entire contract must be examined, because the question of whether the other sections of the contract are truly "unrelated" to intrastate switched access pricing may be subject to interpretation and economic analysis.

TWT states that many contracts produced by CLECs in complaint cases brought by Qwest in other jurisdictions have been similarly redacted. While that is true, what occurred in discovery in other states' complaint proceedings, and was not objected to by Qwest, is neither relevant to this investigation in Arizona, nor binding.

The Commission has determined that this proceeding should examine the phenomenon of contracts for intrastate switched access services, to determine what the policy of the State of Arizona should be in that regard. The commingling of other services into contracts for switched access could present issues that are worthy of examination. Qwest believes that LECs should not be allowed to contractually bundle intrastate switched access with other LEC services in a way that obscures the rate or effectively discounts the rate of intrastate switched access. Whether TWT's contracts raise issues in that regard is something that the parties should be permitted to examine, subject to the safety provided by the Protective Order.

The Motion should be denied for the foregoing reasons.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED, this 23rd day of November, 2009.

QWEST CORPORATION QWEST COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, LLC

20 East Thomas Road 16th Floor

Phoenix, Arizona 85012

602-630-2187 (voice)

602-235-3107 (fax)

Norm.curtright@qwest.com

Attorney for QWEST CORPORATION and **QWEST COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, LLC**

ORIGINAL and fifteen (15) copies of the foregoing filed this 23rd day of November, 2009 with:

Docket Control Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 W. Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007

COPY of the foregoing delivered via U.S. mail or email this 23rd day of November, 2009, to:

Jane L. Rodda Administrative Law Judge Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007

Janice M. Alward Legal Division Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007

Steve Olea, Director Utilities Division Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007

Armando Fimbres
Utilities Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Patrick J. Black Fennemore Craig, P.C. 3003 N. Central Ave., #2600 Phoenix, AZ 85012

Lyndall Nipps Vice President, Regulatory Time Warner Telecom 845 Camino Sur Palm Springs, CA 92262

Michael W. Patten Roshka DeWulf & Patten, PLC One Arizona Center 400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800 Phoenix, AZ 85004

Mr. Charles H. Carrathers, III General Counsel

South Central Region Verizon, Inc. 600 Hidden Ridge HQE03H52 Irving, Texas 75015-2092

Arizona Payphone Association c/o Mr. Gary Joseph Sharenet Communications 4633 West Polk Street Phoenix, AZ 85043

Mr. Dennis D. Ahlers Associate General Counsel Eschelon Telecom, Inc. 730 Second Avenue, Suite 900 Minneapolis, MN 55402

Mr. Thomas Campbell Mr. Michael Hallam Lewis and Roca LLP 40 North Central Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85004

Rex Knowles
Executive Director – External Affairs XO Communications
7050 Union Park Avenue
Suite 400
Midvale, Utah 84047

Mark DiNunzio Cox Arizona Telecom 1550 W. Deer Valley Road MS:DV3-16, Bldg. C 20 Phoenix, AZ 85027

Mr. Nathan Glazier Associate Director, Public Policy Verizon Wireless 4805 East Thistle Landing Drive Phoenix, AZ 85044

Paul Castaneda President, Local 7019 Communication Workers of America 11070 North 24th Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85029 Mr. Stephen H. Kukta Director and Counsel Sprint Nextel 201 Mission Street, Suite 1500 San Francisco, CA 94105

William A. Haas Deputy General Counsel McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc. P.O. Box 3177 6400 SW C Street Cedar Rapids, IA 52406-3177

Brad VanLeur Orbitcom, Inc. 1701 N. Louise Avenue Sioux Falls, SD 57107

Tom Bade, President Arizona Dialtone 7170 W. Oakland Street Chandler, AZ 85226

Karen Nally 3420 E. Shea Boulevard, Suite 200 Phoenix, AZ 85028

Craig Marks 10645 N. Tatum Blvd., Suite 200-676 Phoenix, AZ 85028

Jeffrey W. Crockett One Arizona Center 400 E. Van Buren Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202

Michelle L. Wood RUCO 1110 W. Washington Street, Suite 220 Phoenix, AZ 85007

Isabelle Salgado AT&T Nevada 645 E. Plumb Ln., B132 P.O. Box 11010 Reno, NV 89520 Michael Grant Gallagher & Kennedy, P.A. 2575 E. Camelback Road Phoenix, AZ 85016-9225